UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,477	01/05/2006	Kimoon Kim	1751-394	1349
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER	
			HAQ, SHAFIQUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/563,477	KIM ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	SHAFIQUL HAQ	1641		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Journal</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowanclosed in accordance with the practice under <u>Basin</u>	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> are subject to restriction and/or e				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

 This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. The species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The compound of formula 1 encompasses a large number of structurally and functionally distinct compounds. The compound of formula 1 is made by joining compound of formula 2 with formula 3 compound and each of the compound encompasses a large number of structurally and functionally distinct compounds. As for example, in the compound of formula 3 (i.e. Y₁-R₁-X₁-R₂-X₂-R₃-Y₂), each of the group R1, R2 and R3 can be selected form structurally structurally and functionally distinct compounds such as alkylene, ethylene glycol oligomer, substituted benzene and substituted pyridine and each of the X₁ and X₂ group can be distinct positively charged functional group. Y2 is selected from functional groups reactive to structurally different molecules such a gene or a protein. These structurally and functionally distinct groups in different combinations would generate a large number of structurally and functionally distinct compounds encompassed by the compound of formula 3. In the compound of formula 2, each of the R_4 and R_5 group can be selected from a large number of functionally and structurally distinct groups such a alkenyloxy, hydrogen. substituted alkyl, substituted carboxyalkylsulfinyloxy, substituted substituted carboxyalkyloxy, aminoalkyloxy and substituted hydroxyalkyloxy and n can be 4 to 20. These structurally and functionally diverse

Page 3

groups in different combination and with different values of n would generate a large number of structurally and functionally distinct compounds encompassed by the compound of formula 2. Thus the compound of formula 2, which encompass a large number of structurally and functionally distinct compound and the compound of formula 3, which also encompass a large number of structurally and functionally distinct compounds, in combination would generate an enormous number of different compounds that are structurally, functionally and patentably distinct. Therefore, the compound of claim 1 differ materially in chemical functionality and are structurally diverse and dissimilar compounds, which do not possess a substantial common core wherein a reference anticipating one would not necessarily render the other obvious and to search all the above groups in a single application would be an undue burden on the Examiner. Also the fields of search are not coextensive. Additionally, besides performing a class/subclass search, the Examiner performs a commercial data base search and an automated patent system (text) search. Therefore, because of the reasons given above, the restriction set forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

Therefore, Applicants are required to elect a single species of the following compounds in accordance with the practice set forth in MPEP 803.02 including an exact definition of each and every substitution on the base molecule, wherein a single member at each substitution group or moiety is elected and the elected species must read on the compound from which it depends:

1) a single species for compound of formula 2 including an exact definition of each and every substitution on the base molecule, wherein a single member at each substitution group or moiety is elected.

1) a single species for compound of formula 3 including an exact definition of each and every substitution on the base molecule, wherein a single member at each substitution group or moiety is elected.

1) a single species for compound of formula 1 including an exact definition of each and every substitution on the base molecule, wherein a single member at each substitution group or moiety is elected.

Currently claims 1, 2 and 3 are generic.

Chemical structures, which are similar, are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not irrefutable, but may be overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holding of Application of Papesch, 50 CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and In re Lalu, 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where the structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure.

Page 5

Art Unit: 1641

Upon the election of a single disclosed compound, the scope of the invention, inclusive of the elected compound, will be identified by the Examiner for examination along with the elected species. Moreover, whatever specific compound is ultimately elected, applicants are required to list all claims readable thereon. In the instant case, upon election of a single compound, the Office will review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the independent invention encompassing the elected compound (compounds which are so similar thereto as to be within the same inventive concept and reduction to practice). The scope of an independent invention will encompass all compounds within the scope of the claim, which fall into the same class and subclass as the elected compound, but may also include additional compounds, which fall in related subclasses. Examination will then proceed on the elected compound AND the entire scope of the invention encompassing the elected compound will be determined. A clear statement of the examined invention, defined by those class(es) and subclass(es) will be set forth in the first action on the merits. Note that the restriction requirement will not be made final until such time as applicant is informed of the full scope of compounds along with (if appropriate) the process of using or making said compound under examination. This will be set forth by reference to specific class(es) and subclass(es) examined.

2. The species described above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding technical features for the following reasons: Pursuant to PCT Rule

13.2 and PCT Administrative instructions, Annex B, Part 1 (f)(I)(B)(2), the species are not art recognized equivalents.

- 3. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the compound are not patentably distinct species, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the compound to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
- 4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must also include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more

Art Unit: 1641

of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied

by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(1)

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shafigul Haq whose telephone number is 571-272-

6103. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Long V. Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Shafiqul Haq/

Examiner, Art Unit 1641